INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
YOSHINO, Shinji	18198
Direct by Mr. SHIOBARA	18198
MORNING RECESS	18222
Direct by Mr. SHIOBARA (cont'd)	18223
Cross by Brigadier Quilliam	18230
(Witness excused)	18242
OWADA, Teiji	18243
Direct by Mr. SHIOBARA	18243
NOON RECESS	18246
Direct by Mr. SHIOBARA (cont'd)	18247
AFTERNOON RECESS	18269
(Witness excused)	18270
•KADA, Kikusaburo	18271
Direct by Mr. S. OKAMOTO	18271

INDEX

Of

EXHIPITS

No.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
690	2368		Affidavit of YOSHINO, Shinji dated 14 February 1947 at		10000
			Tokyo, Japan		18202

Wednesday, 12 March 1947 1 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 4 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 5 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 9 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 13 exception of: HONORABLE MR. JUSTICE BERNARD, Member 14 from the Republic of France, not sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Tefense Section, same as before. 17 18 (English to Japanese and Japanese 19 to English interpretation was made by the 20 Language Section, IMTFE.) 21 22 23 24 25

G r 1 e e 2 n b 3 e r 4 g

&

E

d

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKA"A, TOJO and ARAKI, who are represented by their respective counsel. We have certificates from the prison surgeon at Sugamo certifying that the accused ARAKI and TOJO are ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificates will be recorded and filed.

Mr. Blewett.

MR. BLETTT: Sir, I shall give the Court the names, the office and the location of each accused on September 18, 1931.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMMINS CARR: Your Honor, we submit that this is not a matter of evidence. The evidence is already before the Tribunal with regard to that, and, in the document which we handed to the Tribunal, a chronological summary. That was done, not as a matter of evidence, but as a matter of convenient summary of existing evidence for the Court. If the defense have any criticism as to the accuracy of the list they are provided they can put it at the proper time, but we didn't treat it as evidence. It isn't

evidence; it is an argument on evidence. "e are quite prepared to correct it if the defense can show any particular in which it is wrong. But in my submission the defense are not entitled to take up the time of the Court by putting in now as evidence something which is not evidence.

THE PERSIDERT: Did you say you were going to embody in this, or have embodied in this document you are about to read, the contents of some thirty exhibits tendered by the prosecution? The Court would be only too happy to receive even at this time anything that would help to reduce the number of exhibits we must read to discover this information. That was the impression I formed yesterday after consulting my colleagues, and I said so at the time.

Now what do you propose to give us? One document?

MR. BLEWETT: Sir, this is a list of the accused on certain dates. This was comriled from exhibits 103 to 129, which have been put in evidence by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a summary of their evidence? Have you written it all out?

> MR. BLE"DTT: Yes, sir, I have it listed. THE PRESIDENT: Have you copies?

25

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BLE ETT: No, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, how many pages does it cover?

MR. BLE"ETT: About eight pages, your Honor. I think it would not consume more than a half hour.

THE PRESIDENT: Does it cover all the information in the prosecution's thirty exhibits, or only some of it?

MR. BLEVETT: It is simultaneous translation. The Language Section has a copy of this.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if you can get in eight foolscap pages all the prosecution have in some thirty exhibits there is some advantage in what you are proposing.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. CONYNS CARR: Your Fonor, in my submission, if it is to be done at all it should be
processed and circulated so that we can check it, and
may I say at once that if, as my friend says, it is
based on exhibits 103 to 129 only, and ignores
exhibit 102, it will certainly be wrong.

MR. BLE"ETT: It includes 102, sir, and also the Indictment.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think we would

3

1

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

like copies, but I hate to ask you to go to the trouble of providing copies, only to find the evidence rejected later. I think, however, for the time being you had better postpone this part of the case and the Judges will consider what they are going to do.

2344.

MR. BLEWETT: I shall work that out, sir.

If I may refer to defense document 635, the chart of the various cabinet members, investigation was made, if the Tribunal please, and we have ascertained that the number of living cabinet members since 1927 to 1941 who have not been indicted are sixty-two in number.

THE PRESIDENT: That, by the way, is exhibit

MR. BLEWETT: Thank you, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: But, if it be material to prove the number of living cabinet ministers, that must be done by evidence in the ordinary way, and we require, perhaps, certificates of death of those who do not survive.

MR. BLEWETT: I can give a list of those surviving on this chart, sir, if the Tribunal is interested.

THE PRESIDENT: We would require at least certificates of some sort.

MR. BLEWETT: They are all living, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: All those men who have been cabinet ministers since '27?

MR. BLEWETT: I see what your Honor means.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission it would be entirely irrelevant to do so, and I

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

sir.

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

hope that the Tribunal is not accepting the accuracy of document 2344 until we have an opportunity of commenting on it.

THE PRESIDENT: That document was admitted on the usual terms which preserves your right to attack it for inaccuracy.

Well, you cannot prove the sixty-two are living by merely stating the fact. You must prove it in the ordinary way, if it be relevant and material.

MR. BLEWETT: We shall be prepared to do so,

For the time being, if the Members of the Tribunal please, that will conclude subdivision 3 of division one; and Mr. Logan, the chairman of that committee, will resume.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: Our next presentation was with respect to the economic situation in Japan; but, owing to certain difficulties we have had, we are unable to present our documentary evidence, but we do wish to present our witnesses at this time. The documentary evidence will probably come some time later, if that meets with the Tribunal's approval.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you going to open that evidence now, Mr. Logan?

MR. LOGAN: From witnesses, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: You have a right to make an opening statement covering each phase. Are you about to make an opening statement?

MR. LOGAN: No. We will present the witnesses. We have made our opening statement.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not recollect one touching this particular phase, but I recollect the general opening. However, you do not propose to have a particular opening?

MR. LOGAN: That's right. This comes under that general opening statement made at the beginning of division 1.

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed to call your wit-

Mr. SHIOBARA.

MR. SHIOBARA: May the witness YOSHINO be called.

3

6

7

9

11

12

14 15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25

SHINJI YOSHINO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, having first been duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHIOBARA:

Q Please tell me your name, the date of your birth, and your address.

A My name is YOSHINO, Shinji. I was born on September 17, 1888. My present address is Shinagawa Ku, Kamiosaki, Chojamaru 270.

Q Please give us a succinct statement of your education and of the public offices you have occupied.

Imperial University. As for my career, I was twice connected with two companies: the Tohokukogyo and the Manshujukogyo, the Manshu Heavy Industry Company. And I have also served as prefectural governor. However, on the whole, I think I can safely say that my whole career has been spent as an official of the Commerce and Industry Ministry. The main posts which I held in that office are as stated in my affidavit.

Q Mr. Liebert made a very long statement -gave very long testimony in this court about Japanese
economy. Have you read it?

THE MONITOR: Leonomic preparations for war in October of last year.

A Yes, I did.

Q I will show you document -- defense document

Q I will show you document -- defense document No. 690. Will you tell us if this an affidavit which you have made yourself after reading and studying Mr. Liebert's testimony and prepared in answer to it?

THE PRESIDENT: What is the delay due to? Why the delay?

MR. SHIOBARA: I wish to read the affidavit of the witness, if it is his and he is satisfied that he has certified that it is his. The affidavit is not here, and we have gone to fetch it, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you should have given notice, and it would have been here.

buda & Whalen

Q Then while we are waiting I would like to put another short question to the witness. You have stated that your <u>curriculum vitae</u> is contained in your affidavit, but could you give us a very brief outline of it here?

A I graduated from the university in 1913 and immediately entered what was then called the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce as a junior clerk. In 1925 this ministry was remodeled into two departments called the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

Since entering the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce I served continuously in that ministry and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, sometimes as section chief, sometimes as bureau chief, until in 1936 I was appointed Vice-Minister of Commerce and Industry.

I believe there has been a mistake in the interpretation: In 1936 I resigned as Vice-Minister of Commerce and Industry, and I was appointed as such in 1931 -- 1927.

The MONITOR: Correction. There has been a mistake in the translation: I did not state that I was appointed as the Vice-Minister of the Commerce and Industry Ministry, but rather that I was appointed as

Vice-Minister in 1927.

THE PRESIDENT: The Clerk of the Court informs me that the affidavit of this witness has not been filed in the office of the General Secretary, but that it is now in the office of one of the defense attorneys whom he named.

A In 1937 I was appointed Minister of Commerce and Industry, and I resigned the following year, 1938, May.

In the eight months between the time of my resignation as Vice-Minister of Commerce and Industry and my appointment as Minister of Commerce and Industry I served as president of the Tohoku Kogyo Development Company. And in 1938 I was appointed vice-president of the Manchuria Heavy Industry Development Company and served as such for two years, at the end of 1938.

During the war I served as Governor of Aichi Prefecture for two years.

That is the whole of my public career.

MR. SHIOBARA: I am very sorry of this delay in getting the original, but the copies of the affidavit have been distributed to everybody.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, in the interest of time we will not raise an objection to

reading from the copy in lieu of the absence of the original. THE PRESIDENT: Proceed with the copy. 3 (Whereupon, a document was handed to 4 the witness.) 5 With the Court's permission, I have given you a copy of defense document No. 960. Will you please look at it, examine it, and tell us if this is the affidavit you have made in reply to Mr. Liebert's statement. Correction: 690. 10 A There is no mistake. 11 MR. SHIOBARA: I shall present the original 12 in a moment when it comes. I wish now to present in 13 14 evidence defense document 690, and read it. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 16 Tender a copy with the consent of the prose-17 cution. You can tender the original later. 18 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 690 19 will receive exhibit No. 2368. 20 (Whereupon, the document above 21 referred to was marked defense document 22 No. 2368, and was received in evidence.) 23 THE PRESIDENT: He looks at a document handed

24

MR. SHIOBAKA: I shall start reading this

to him by the Marshal of the Court.

document from now. However, there is a correction on page 12: The sixth line from the bottom where it has "shipping charges," this should be corrected to 3 "ship building costs." 4 THE PRESIDENT: Was that a copy that was 5 handed to him? We don't know. The nature of every document handled by a witness in the box must be 7 disclosed in the record. What is that document that 8 was handed to him by the Marshal? I don't know. 9 MR. SHIOBARA: The document handed to the 10 witness by the Marshal of the Court is the original 11 of the document 690 which has to be tendered. 12 13 THE PRESIDENT: I suspected that was so. 14 Now, you know that must be tendered. Ask him 15 whether that is the original and whether that is his 16 affidavit.

Q Mr. Witness, did you see the original?

A Yes, I did.

Q Is that your affidavit of which we have been speaking up to now?

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, tender it.

Mk. SHIOBARA: I tender this document No. 690 in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: It will bear the same

17

•

18

19 20

21 22

23

number as the copy already tendered. Defense document 1 690 has received exhibit No. 2368. 2 Mk. SHIOBAKA: I shall begin reading. 3 THE PRESIDENT: We have no copies. Where 4 are the copies? (Whereupon, copies of the document were handed to the Court.) 7 MA. SHIOBARA: May I begin? 8 THE PRESIDENT: We all have copies. Proceed 9 to read. 10 MR. SHIOBARA: "Sworn Deposition. Deponent 11 YOSh.Ilo Shinji. Having duly sworn an cath as on 12 attached sheet and in accordance with the procedure 13 followed in my country I hereby depose as follows: 14 On this 14 day of February 1947 at Tokyo. 15 16 "Leponent YOSHINO, Shinji (seal). 17 18 19 20 21 22

25

23

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"Statement Refuting Mr. Liebert's Testimony.

"I entered the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce in 1913 as a junior clerk. (Later, in 1925, this ministry was remodelled into two independent departments, namely, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and Ministry of Commerce and Industry.) Since then, I had been continuously in charge of administrative affairs in the Commerce and Industry Ministry until I resigned in 1936, as Vice-Minister of Commerce and Industry. In 1937, I was appointed Minister of Commerce and Industry and, as such, was responsible for formulating and executing wartime economic policies of our country for one year at the outset of the China Incident. Therefore, I can safely state that I was concerned either directly or indirectly with almost all of the various economic policies touched upon by Mr. Liebert in his testimony. I understand that Mr. Liebert regards these policies as acts preparatory for an aggressive war. Upon my part, I will try to explain briefly the reasons pointing to the contrary from the viewpoint of one of the government officials of that period.

"I shall refrain from speaking here of the matters subsequent to the outbreak of the China Incident, because of the fact that economic measures

24

acopted after the outbreak of the Incident are indicative of genuine wartime economy rather than of war
preparations. Notwithstanding the utmost efforts made
by the Government then to check the aggravation of the
Incident, the situation turned unfortunately from
bad to worse. Thus, it was only natural that the control
of various fields of comestic economy was being
tightened from day to day. Furthermore, having retired
from the service in 1938, I had no relation whatsoever
with the events which occurred thereafter. I will
explain the points raised by Mr. Liebert with regard to
our commercial and industrial policies prior to the
China Incident, dividing them for convenience's sake,
into two separate chapters.

"(1) Policy for the Establishment of Basic Industries.

changes had taken place in the relationship between war and economy both in theory and practice. Even previous to that, war was not wholly unrelated with the economic power of a country especially in such matters as food supplies, arms, ammunitions and military expenditures. However, it was usual for a major belligerent Power to be able by itself to cater to all its needs within the limits of its own economic power,

inasmuch as the scale of a war was smaller and efficiency and quality of arms undeveloped. Had there been shortages in some particular articles, it could always avail itself of supplies from neutral countries as there had never been a case of the entire world being involved in the same war. For instance, Japan fought the Russo-Japanese War relying on her loans from the United States and Great Britain; in other words, she fought on while importing materials necessary for the prosecution of war. However, international trade was completely interrupted in World War I as the major powers of the world were practically all involved in the tumult of the war. Battles which were waged on an enormous scale called for the exhaustion of all economic resources. Especially, the advent of high explosives, aircraft and chemical arms such as poison gas proved the existence of grave deficiencies in the past military and naval armaments as a means of national defence. Therefore, it became a matter of common sense in formulating economic policies of a country to strive at all costs for the building up of necessary industries in order to guarantee its independence and security. This practice which started during war time remained as an important factor even in the management of the postwar economy in every

2

5

7

10

11

13

14

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

country. One would readily understand the inevitability and reasonableness of the facts pointed out by Mr. Liebert, if one recalled that the economic thought prevalent and the policies adopted after World War I were reflected in the practical measures taken by the powers since that time.

"I shall try to explain a few instances on the basis of Mr. Liebert's statement.

"a) Lyes and Glycerine.

"It was shown by the German dye incustry in the course of World War I that high explosives and poison gases could be manufactured in the process of making dyes. Prior to the war dye manufacturing was monopolized by Germany, the rest of the world depending on her for its supplies. Therefore, a decision was adopted in 1917 at a conference among the allied powers in Paris recommending the development of the dye industry in various countries for the reason that, although it was a belated step to be of any use in that stage of the war, a monopoly of the world's dyes market by the German dye industry could not be allowed to continue as it would remain a menace to the world peace. The powers suffered from a famine of dyes due to the stoppage of the imports of German dyes while the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and

19

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22 23

24

Japan frantically pushed shead their respective dye industries. Established then in England was the Government supported British Dyestuff Corporation which, if my memory serves me right, later was merged with the Imperial Chemical Company. In the United States companies such as Dupont and the National Aniline Co. were set up. Also in our country, which was then in need of dyes as well as glycerine enacted in 1917 a law called the 'Law for the promotion of the manufacture of dyes and medicines. On the strength of this law the government set up two companies, one for the manufacture of dyes and the other of glycerine, which it guaranteed against all losses and for the payment of an 8 per cent dividend on their paid up capital. This method of guarantee was continued until after the war. Even after the expiration of the term of ten years of governmental support, subsidies per unit were paid to the dyes produced. It is a wellknown fact that both the United States and Japan enforced the import license system when they again imported German dyes after the termination of the war. For its inception the Japanese dye manufacture is indebted to the policies of protection and encouragement, however lukewarm they may have been. That it would be turned into an arsenal of chemical arms in

4 5

2

3

7

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

case of war was a foregone conclusion since the time of its establishment. The same applies to the case of glycerine. The production of glycerine was negligible before the war since it was made only as a byproduct of the manufacture of soap and the bulk of the demand was met by imports from abroad. Hence the manufacture of glycerine had to be started by dissolving fatty acids using as the basis beef tallow imported from Australia. This was easily done as the process was not so difficult technically as compared with the manufacture of dyes, so much so that the payment of government subsidies was discontinued before the expiration of the ten-year term. However, coagulated fish oil was later used as the raw material for manufacturing fatty acids, as it was considered prejudicial to national defence to depend on the supply of beef tallow from abroad. Since fish oil could be obtained in large quantities from inshore fisheries, it was decided to export it abroad in peace time and use it as the basis for the manufacture of glycerine in case of an emergency. Therefore, it was only natural that the production of glycerine was boosted following the outbreak of the China Incident as the wartime economy developed in Japan.

"b) Iron Production.

"The establishment of the iron industry was a pending question in our country since the restoration of 1868, as it is an industry so basically important among the industries of a nation that the modern period following Industrial Revolution, has also been called the 'era of iron and coal.' This, however, was a difficult task for our country which had little iron ore and coal resources for the manufacture of iron. The Japanese iron industry went through successive changes from the time of the inauguration of the Yawata Iron Works after the Sino-Japanese War to 1933 when the Japan Steel Manufacture Co. was established. It would suffice to mention here the fact that the Japan Steel Manufacture Co. was not found in a single day, as I cannot afford to recount here in detail the history of the iron industry in Japan. The Law for the Promotion of Iron Manufacture, providing for special privileges and the power for compulsory use of land to protect the iron industry, has been enacted since 1917 when a dearth of iron occurred due to World War I. As early as in 1916, the government instructed the Board of Investigation of Iron Manufacture to coordinate the governmental and civilian iron productions despite the fact that the development of the civilian iron industry was still negligible as vet. A report was

2

1

5

7

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

made by the Board of Investigation of Emergency
Financial and Economic Affairs, during the period of
the financial depression, brought about as an aftermath
of World War I, recommending that large-scale
joint-management of the governmental and civilian iron
foundries should be made with the Yawata Iron Works as
its nucleus. In the meantime, the government's basic
policy towards the iron industry changed. Utmost
importance was first attached by the Government to
iron manufacture relying on pig iron imported from the
Chinese Han Yeh Pin Corporation. Later, a complete
process of steel manufacture was acopted in view of
economizing fuel and obtaining by-products such as
gas and tar.

Spratt & Yelder

It was not a long time ago that a full-fledged iron industry was finally established in Japan when arrangements had been made to import coal and coke from China and iron-ore from Korea, China and the South Seas. The Extraordinary Industrial Council, which met in 1930 to discuss measures to overcome the prevalent economic depression, decided in conclusion to set up a single iron manufacturing company by amalgamating the government-owned Yawata Iron Foundry and civilian iron foundries mainly manufacturing pig iron or ordinary steel materials. It was thus that the Japan Iron Manufacturing Company came into being.

"c) Petroleum

"The output of petroleum in our country during the period between World War I and the beginning of the Showa Era (TN. 1926 and later years) was only about 300,000 kilolitres. Even so, the demand for petroleum in our country in 1910-1920 was not so great that until 1920 Japan could meet half of her domestic demands with her home production. However, the demands for petroleum, especially benzine, increased considerably along with the popularization of automobiles and the development of the manufacture of rubber and grease. With the production of petroleum at home remaining on the former level, its proportion against the domestic

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

demands became nothing but a trifle in recent years. Therefore, the government conducted, after World War I, various studies and investigations of measures for obtaining an adequate supply of petroleum and had the necessary installations made. Subsidies paid for encouraging the prospecting of oil deposits since 1900 when a geological survey was conducted and, with a view to making studies in liquid fuels, the Fuel Research Institute was set up as a governmental organization whose mission was to conduct researches in low temperature carbonization and coal liquefaction. No way was found, however, to alter the fact that the main portion of the oil supplies had to be imported from abroad in order to satisfy the domestic demands. But the importation of gasoline particularly was controlled practically by the American Standard 011 Company and the British Rising Sun Petroleum Company.

"There have also been established recently petroleum refineries which rely on imported crude oil. A strange phenomenon was presented in about 1932, when the retail price of gasoline in Japan became cheaper than in any other market in the whole world, as both Japanese oil refineries and the American and British companies held large stocks of gasoline and competed intensely among each other.

23 24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

"Competition between the Japanese and foreign companies soon ended following the conclusion of a mutual agreement between them. But in 1933, there appeared again signs of excessive competition among oil dealers, as the importation of gasoline from Soviet Russia was started anew. Although a cheap price of gasoline was welcome, it would ultimately have proven disadvantageous to the consumers if the market were plunged in confusion due to extreme over-stocking and competition. The Law for the Petroleum Industry was therefore enacted in 1934 with a view to stabilizing the oil market. This law stipulated, on one hand, that the government would guarantee to the existing oil refineries and importers the protection of their vested business interests but, on the other hand, it made them bear certain obligations towards the government, one of them being that of keeping stocks. Originally dealers held, as a rule, stocks of oil sufficient to cover about three months in order to ensure smooth operation of their business. However, it was ordered that this be increased to a six-months supply, but there was not a single reason given that it was for military purposes. The purpose was to ensure a sufficient supply for the domestic industries. To order the dealers to retain

23

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

a certain fixed quantity under certain specified conditions followed the example of French legislation. At any rate, inasmuch as our petroleum market was under the control of foreign petroleum, if, in case our supply is cut off by some circumstances, it would place our country into very great difficulties. Although possession in stock of a six-month supply does not necessarily mean that the stock would ensure security, the idea was nothing more than that in the meantime further supplies could be obtained. As it was thought by the legislative authorities that the importation of Soviet gasoline would make the two Anglo-American companies momentarily feel uneasy, the policy would be to permit, in principle, importers to monopolize the importation of petroleum in the future which would induce them to gladly keep a three-month stock.

"However, upon the enforcement of the law, it became clear that the two Anglo-American companies would not agree to keep stocks over and above what they already had from the standpoint of their business requirements. Thus the dilemma was confronted that the law would be ignored and that furthermore if we could not have the two companies import oil, we would face difficulty. Thereupon, representatives were sent

18

19 20

21

23

by the head offices of the Anglo-American companies 1 to Tokyo where frequent negotiations were conducted. As a result, a compromise was reached whereby the 3 two companies also would keep a six-month supply in stock as provided by the law but the government would pay, in return, the cost of the petroleum, cost for the construction of oil tanks, cost of depreciation of the oil during the said period, cost of insurance, 8 interest, etc. Even in case of negotiations with 9 the Ministry of Finance in connection with the payment 10 11 of the costs, the purpose of stocks referred to above 12 would be based upon industrial requirements. If the 13 purpose were military, then the request would be 14 made out of the Army and Navy expenditures. It was 15 the opinion of the then Finance Minister, the late 16 TAKAHASHI, Korekiyo that a request for funds under 17 the guise that it would be used for national defense, 18 hiding behind the government department in charge of 19 the industrial matters, cannot be permitted. That 20 was the reason why the costs referred to were included 21 in the appropriations assigned to the Ministry of 22 Commerce and Industry. 23

24

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

"d) Construction of good ships.

"I was connected with the program for dismantling old ships and building superior vessels enforced in 1932 as a member of the committee formed for that purpose, although the matter was principally under the charge of the Communications Ministry. Prior to this and during the time of depression after 1929, investigations had been made by the Commerce and Industry Ministry with a view to rationalizing the shipbuilding industry. In my understanding, the shipbuilding industry does not limit itself only to the construction of the ship itself but is also linked with numerous other industries because of the necessity of installing various equipments in the ship's interior, which fact makes it a composite industry. Therefore, the rise or fall of the shipbuilding industry affects, needless to say, shipyards as well as a number of other industries, particularly hard hit among them being medium and small-scale industries. According to the result of the special studies conducted in those days, it became known that more than helf of the shipping charges were being spent for the benefit of industries other than shipbuilding. Therefore, the problem whether or not there is work in the shippards is closely related with the problem

18

20

21

22

24

of unemployment in other industries. It was from this point of view that the program for dismantling old ships and building modern and superior vessels was formulated in 1932. It was only natural that the policy of building modern and superior vessels was adopted inasmuch as the shipping charges constituted an important element for maintaining our international trade balance as a source of revenue other than from ordinary trade. The same explanation can be given to the case of the enforcement by England of the Trade Facility Act in 1921. The said law provided from the viewpoint of the prevention of unemployment, for the government's guarantee of payment covering both the principal and interest of the loans raised by the shipbuilding companies. Before the law was abolished in 1927, the government had guaranteed for the loans totaling 74,251,780 pounds, of which more than 21,600,000 pounds or about thirty per cent were raised by civilian shipyards, ranking first among the companies. I believe that this example is ample proof of the importance attached to the shipbuilding industry as a means to cope with the depression and to give relief to unemployment.

"2. Measures for Rationalizing the Industries.

"The movement for the rationalization of the

3

7

6

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

industries was started in our country in 1930-1931 following the world-wide depression of 1929. In those days, it was not a problem which merely concerned our country but was an economic policy common to all the countries in the world including Britain, the United States, Germany, France and Italy. Our country was rather late in following suit and the measures which we enforced were modeled after those of other countries. I cannot afford to idle away time here in explaining fully the basic ideology of industrial rationalization, suffice to say, it was a problem of readjusting industries which had sprung up in all countries like so many mushrooms after the rain during World War I. All the belligerent powers had not only expanded their existing industries but also had set up new industries, as best they could, in order to produce various articles for the supply of which they had depended on other countries prior to the war. This tendency was not limited only to the belligerent powers, but neutral powers and also to adopt economic policies of self-sufficiency as the result of the complete paralyzation of international trade. As a result, world economy was confronted when the war ended, with extremely excessive supplies as compared with the demands. In addition to it, the

18

19 20

21

23 24

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

23 24

25

purchasing power of the countries had been decreased tremendously due to wartime dissipations.

"Therefore, it was incumbent upon the world powers then to adopt new economic policies whereby to readjust and wind up war industries. The execution of such policies, however, would have given rise to severe unemployment in various fields of industries. It was something that the statesmen of a country were utterly unable to do at a time when the current of labor unrest was sweeping all over the world. Hence, efforts to maintain industrial equipments and installations, expanded or commenced during the time of the war, were made at unreasonable costs. The universal economic principle of 'Give and Take' was not observed any more by the powers which now followed the policy of 'Take and Take.' One would readily understand the situation which prevailed if one recalled measures taken by the countries at that time in order to encourage the use of domestic products. In England, even postage stamps bore a slogan discouraging foreign products and which branded those using foreign articles as 'traitors.' Our country also Collowed suit by starting in the late 1920's, a movement for the promotion of the domestic industries and use of home products."

THE PRESIDENT: That will do for the time being. This, of course, is not merely a statement of fact; it is an argument; and we must decide matters that this witness purports to decide for us. That will be understood, even in the absence of an objection by the prosecution.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

("hereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. SHIOBARA.

MR. SHIOBARA: (Reading continued)

"It was then that we realized afresh the necessity for firmly establishing the manufacturing industries which would become the foundation of all the industries of a country. Discussions were made of the measures aimed at establishing such industries as iron manufacturing, air nitrogen fixation, ball bearing, soda ash and petroleum. In spite of desperate efforts, however, there appeared no prospects of recovery, as it was a case of economic depression resulting from a disparity between demand and supply, excessive supply, and over-capitalization of the industries. Especially the peculiar feature of our industry was that it largely depended on the numerous medium-and small-scale manufacturers for the production of articles for export. It is a well-known fact that some overseas markets were once plunged into such confusion due to reckless competition that vigorous complaints were made by the dealers of Japanese goods abroad. Although it seemed superficially true that the cheaper the articles importers buy, the greater would be their profits, it was not necessarily so, for the Japanese articles, which the importers thought

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

were bought at a cheap price, would be undersold by still cheaper articles that would flow into the market a short while later, thus incurring ultimate loss to the earlier importers. Japan was flooded then with complaints, coming from all over the world, for tagging unnecessarily low prices to her goods and with requests to give them even if higher, more stable prices to her export articles. Japan was thus confronted with the necessity to maintain order at least among those of the modium-and small-scale industrialists who were manufacturing important export items and to suppress reckless and excessive competition among them. However, we were reluctant to allow the government's authority to interfere wantonly with popular economic activities, in as much as our successive cabinets, since the Meiji era, had been observing the principle of Free Industry as their golden rule. As a result, the system of the industrialists' associations was devised with a view to maintaining order in the same line of trade. Nevertheless, even when the majority of the industrialists had reached an agreement of views, there always remained a handful or perverse heretics, who, far from opposing the agreement itself of the association, hoped inwardly for the materialization of the agreement among the members of the association to act freely as

'outsiders' and reap unreasonable profits by taking

•)

20

21

22 23

24

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

advantage of the control enforced by the associations.

It may be said that they formed a sort of 'parasitic industry.' Therefore, it became unavoidable to exercise the government's authority to cope with such practice, for, had it been left unrestrained, order could not be maintained in the fields of medium-and-small-scale industries nor their wholesome development expected.

"It was purely in this sense that control was enforced on the association system. It aimed, namely, at compelling the minority that has not joined the association to comply with the agreement of the association in cases where the majority of the members autonomously concluded an agreement in order to maintain order and stability within the field of their own industry. Simultaneously, a policy was adopted whereby the state supported the community institutions of the association so that the industrialists would benefit by joining the association also in respect to their individual business managements. At the outset, this policy was applied exclusively to the medium-and small-scale manufacturers of important export articles. However, shortly after the enforcement of the said system, it became known that the distinction between the products for domestic use and those for export purposes was not necessarily clear and that excessive competition among medium-and

24

small-scale manufacturers of the articles for domestic use also tended to bring about harmful confusion in the field concerned. The law was, therefore, revised so as to make it applicable without distinction to all mediumand small-scale industries. Meanwhile, the government assumed in the beginning an attitude of laisse-faire towards comparatively large-scale industrialists, as it took the view that they would be different from the medium-and small-scale industrialists who had little culture, technique, and experience, and that, if they wished to avoid the harms of wanton competition, the large-scale industrialists should and would arrange their matters by their own hands. While the worldwide economic depression was being aggravated with the year 1929 as the turning point, Japan, on her part, adopted a number of counter-measures, including the lifting of the gold embargo, which, however, resulted momentarily in a complete suffociation of our industrial activities. Just then, the government was going ahead with its efforts for industrial rationalization and assisting in various ways the large-scale industries such as ship-building, fertilizer, electricity, machines, iron and cement, in effecting their liquidation, joint-management or merger. But none of such efforts brought about a satisfactory settlement owing to diverse reasons. It was then

-

18

10

11

12

14

15

16

20

21

23

that the government came to take the view that the state should exercise its authority also on the large-scale industries at the time of an economic crisis. Under those circumstances, the Law For The Control of Vital Industries was enforced in 1931. Judging from its name, the said law seems to be strongly tinted with the ideology of Totalitarian economy, but, by examining its content, one finds that it is not so in the least.

"This law aimed, as a whole, at the controlling of medium-and small-scale industries and at voluntary agreement among the industrialists in the same line of trade. It was based upon the principle that the state would intervene with its authority to control the minority of the industrialists only when it did not comply with the desires of the majority. It was not, therefore, purported to allow the wielding of the authority of the government in order to satisfy the needs of the national policies against the desires of the majority of the industrialists. It was, it may also be said, a measure for promoting cartels. Opinions are divided as to whether cartels should be supported or discouraged and every country has its own practical policy which may differ from that of any other country. Whereas the United States government placed the trusts under a strict control since the enactment of the Sherman Act prohibiting the

25

10

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

trusts, The National Industry Recovery Act enforced by President Roosevelt openly announced the government's support and protection of the trusts and cartels as a means to overcome the emergency. The European countries are generally prepared both for supporting and controlling them according to the circumstances.

"With respect to the cartel question, the Japanese government drafted cartel legislation, generally using as reference, studies made and published by the League of Nations. Among the stipulations in the law for the control of vital industries, there are stipulations for the control of cartels in addition to those for their promotion. The order for the registration of control agreements are in line with the idea of giving them due publicity. It appears as to be nothing more than 16 registration, but as a matter of fact it follows the 17 principle of the Clayton Act in the United States which 18 seeks to expose such matters widely to public opinion 19 and criticism by giving publicity to the contents of such 20 measures, a step which is considered to be more preferable 21 than control of penalties. Plan for industrial ration-22 alization in our country, especially the various plans in connection with the control of enterprises, follows the orthodox methods practiced by the various countries 25 since the World War I and does not, in any way, deviate

from those methods. The establishment of the special
Measures Law of 1937 concerning import and export restrictions falls into an entirely different category. This is
a basic law for the enforcement of war-time economy. A
number of war-time economic laws were created on the
basis of the foregoing law, but this is a measure adopted
by other countries as well out of the compelling necessities
of the war and requires no explanation."

That is all. You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Cuilliam.

BRICADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, I assume that there is no further examination or cross-examination on the part of the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: Your assumption appears to be correct.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY BRIGADIER QUILLIAM:

O Witness, I want to draw your attention to a sentence from your affidavit commencing at the bottom of page 1. It is as follows:

"I shall refrain from speaking here of
the matters subsequent to the outbreak of the China
Incident because of the fact that economic measures
adopted after the outbreak of the incident are
indicative of genuine war-time economy rather than of
war preparations."

Now. Witness, when you refer to genuine war-time economy there, may I take it that you are referring to the war in Chine?

A Yes, I use the word "genuine war economy" in connection with the China Incident.

And you meant that all economic measures after the China Incident had reference to the war

2

4

,

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in China?

A What I have written in my affidavit pertains to the one year that I was in the office of Minister of Commerce and Industry with respect to the plans and policies taken by that ministry during my tenure of office, and generally my statements in the affidavit were written with reference to the statements made by Mr. Liebert. To the extent that the matter was treated in the statement given to this Tribunal by Mr. Liebert, I explained our economy as being a war-time economy, and therefore it does not necessarily mean that the economic policies taken during this one year are entirely of a war-time nature, that is, the policies taken by the government.

Q Very well.

Now, you were familiar, were you not, with the various production plans that were made during the year 1937?

A I do not recall very definitely as to what particular plan or plans were taken in the year 1937, that is, war-time production plans, but I do know that various plans were made in the face of war-time necessity -- for instance, with reference to the production of synthetic petroleum, that is,

.

the increase in the production of synthetic pe-1 troleum. 2 And you remember the war officers' plan 3 for the production -- the 5-year Plan for the production of important war materials? I do not know. Do you remember that being referred to frequently in Mr. Liebert's statement? 8 Yes, I frequently noticed that in the 9 statement of Mr. Liebert, and also a number of 10 references to 5-year plans; but I do not have any 11 recollection whatsoever of having been associated 12 with a 5-year Plan as the responsible head of the 13 14 Ministry of Industry and Commerce. 15 Very well, I will bring that to your notice 16 later. 17 Now I want to draw your attention to a 18 speech made by the accused SATO on March 10, 1942. 19 BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: This is exhibit 849, 20 if the Tribunal pleases. 21 Do you remember that speech? 22 I do not have any recollection. 23 It was made on the Army Day commemora-24 tion in 1942. Does that refresh your memory?

I do not know.

4

1

2

5

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

All right. I will read you a portion of that speech from page 5, at the bottom of the page.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you going to adopt Sir Charles Russell's formula: Would you be surprised to know that SATO said this? It is very questionable.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, I thought he would know, but it is immaterial for my purpose whether he had heard the speech before or not.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: I will read the following extract:

"In 1936 our army formulated a national defense plan, for the army felt keenly the necessity of expanding armaments and productive power in order to secure and develop the results of the Manchurian Incident. As the expansion of armaments and rearmament by the European Powers were to be completed by 1941 or 1942, we enticipated an international crisis at about that time. Therefore, considering it necessary to complete by every means possible the expansion of our armaments and productive power by 1942, we decided to effect a great expansion by means of a six-year armament plan for the period

1937 to 1942, and a five-year production expansion 1 plan for the period 1937 to 1941." 2 May it please the Tribunal, I had hoped 3 that I would be able to read the whole of this 4 extract in one reading. I thought that the trans-5 lation section would be able to deal with it, as 6 they were given notice that I was going to use this 7 exhibit. 9 THE MONITOR: Brigadier Cuilliam, we can, sir, except that we have to know where you will start and where you will end in that case. If you will tell us that we will have it put on the I.B.M. and have it read simultaneously. Can you tell us 14 that now? THE PRESIDENT: They want the pages of the Japanese text, I suppose. BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: I began at the bottom of page 5. THE MONITOR: Yes. BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: And I am going to the end of that paragraph, on page 6, to the words "a

rough estimate."

THE MONITOR: Thank you sir.

Is that all?

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: That is all.

8

10

11 12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

(Continuing) "In 1937, the first year of this plan, the Lukouchiao Incident broke out." 2

THE MONITOR: Just a minute, Brigadier Quilliam; the sound engineer is adjusting the machine. All right.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: I will repeat those "In 1937, the first year of this plan, the Lukeuchiao Incident broke out. What worried us most was the fear that this incident might cause the break-down of our Armament Expansion Plan and the Five-Year Production Expansion Plan. So we decided to see that the Chinese Incident would not end in a war of attrition to our side. Accordingly, generally speaking, we spent 40% of our budget on the Chinese Incident and 60% on armament expansion. In respect to iron and other important materials allotted to the army, we spent 20% on the Chinese Incident and 80% on the expansion of armaments. As result, the sir force and mechanized units have been greatly expanded and the fighting power of the whole Japanese Army has been increased to more than three times what it was before the China Incident. I believe that our Navy, which suffered very little attrition in the China Affair must have perfected and expended its fighting power. Of course, produc-

19 20

21 22

23

24

tive power of the munition industry has been expended 70 to 80% at a rough estimate."

Q Witness, do you now recall anything of that speech?

A I do not.

O Having heard that extract read, do you still say that the economic plans adopted after the outbreak of the Incident are indicative of genuine war-time economy rather than of war preparations?

As I have said before, my affidavit has been prepared viz a viz the statement given by Mr. Liebert, and that is the primary urpose of my affidavit, and that after the outbreak of the China Incident I state that we entered a period of wartime economy -- a genuine war-time economy.

Now, the speech with reference to the 5year Plan given by SATO is an extirely separate question, and so far as I know, I don't know of any
5-year Plan during my tenure of office as Minister
of Commerce and Industry, and we did not have any
competence to formulate any production plans with
reference to purely national defense matters; we,
that is to say, the Commerce and Industry Ministry.

.

Morse & Bartton

2

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q Did you not know of the outline of the five year plan for production of war materials dated June 23, 1937 produced by the War Office?

A That matter has been referred to a number of times in Mr. Liebert's statement but it is entirely new to me. Although I do not feel that I am unaware of events, still it was for the first time that I heard of such a plan when I saw Mr. Liebert's statement.

Q Did you consider what Mr. Liebert said about it?

A Yes, I read it but I am not familiar with the subject matter as treated by Mr. Liebert. I have merely been asked by the defense to give my opinions of facts with respect to the statements made by Mr. Liebert in so far as they relate to me as Minister of Commerce and Industry during the period that I held that office.

THE MONITOR: And I prepared my statement with emphasis on what I knew.

Q Do you mean to say, Mr. Witness, that in preparing your statement you disregarded matters like this five year plan?

A No, I didn't disregard it. I saw it, I read it, but I have only touched upon such matters as were

18

19

21 22

23

24

directly connected with me when I was holding this office and inasmuch as I wasn't directly connected with these matters I didn't touch upon them because I felt that I wasn't in a position to speak about them authoritatively. May I add just a word? The Ministry of Commerce and Industry is in charge of administration of manufacturing and industries but not all of the industries and manufacturing in Japan. For instance, ship building was in the hands -- was under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Communications while the manufacture of aircraft was entirely outside of the competence and jurisdiction of any economic ministry.

Q Witness, at the moment I am not concerned with whether these plans came under your ministry or not.

Is that clear ?

A Yes.

Q What I am concerned about is this: that you have come along here prepared, you say, to refute Mr. Liebert's testimony. That is so, isn't it?

A Well, you have used the word "refute" but my purrose in writing my effidevit was to point out the facts with which I was personally directly or indirectly connected with and by doing so to point out any errors in fact that existed in Mr. Liebert's statement.

Q Vitness, I have used the word "refute" because that is the word you used in your statement. Is that clear?

THE MONITOR: Brigadier Quilliam, in the Japanese text the word "refute" is not there. It just says statement vis-a-vis Mr. Liebert's statement which is translated into English as "refute".

A That seems to be a language question. I have read Mr. Liebert's statement in its entirety and there are many matters and far-reaching matters with which I have never been personally connected with and, therefore, I have never throughout my affidavit used the word "refute." I have constantly said -- mentioned my position -- my statements vis-a-vis Liebert's statement. And, therefore, I have said that I am only discussing matters with which I was personally and directly connected with and that I am merely tying to point out facts in which I find myself at variance with that of Mr. Liebert. In the final analysis it may amount to the same thing but at least my position is that I am not trying to refute but trying to point out the mistakes.

Q The point I am interested in is this: Am I to understand that you do not attempt in any way to deal with the five year plan mentioned in Mr. Liebert's

statement? Is that so?

A This is a matter with regard to which I have not only no recollection but no knowledge and so if questions pertaining to them were asked me I should think I should be unable to answer them.

Q But before coming here you made no attempt to find out what was in those plans?

A That I didn't do at all because I didn't have any data in the first place and I have no knowledge of it.

Q And yet you say in your statement that you were concerned either directly or indirectly with almost all of the various economic policies touched upon by Mr. Liebert in his testimony.

A Perhaps explanations were insufficient in that regard but what I meant to say was that as an administrative officer I was referring to matters to which I was either concerned as an administrative officer in connection with matters pointed out by Mr. Liebert in his statement as an administrative officer of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: Under those circumstances, if it please the Tribunal, I will not proceed with the cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you might point out

2

5

Ĭ

8

9

10

11

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

in Mr. Liebert's statement where Liebert dealt with SATO's exposition of the five year plan. Unless this man knew the five year plan he couldn't purport to speak with any assurance on Japanese economy during that period.

BRIGADIFR QUILLIAM: I thought that a witness who came along here to deal with Mr. Liebert's evidence would at least have taken the trouble to understand the basic features underlying Mr. Liebert's evidence, and I was amazed to find, if it pleast the Tribunal, that although in Mr. Liebert's evidence the extract from SATO's speech is quoted and given roint apparently the witness has never heard of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I think if the counsel will not get unduly excited about this you will find there will be another witness that will take up a subsequent period and reference to page 1 of the witness' testimony, the second paragraph says he is talking of the matters prior to the outbreak of the China Incident of which he has knowledge and there will be other witnesses who will take up this matter and deal with it.

THE PRESIDEN: Captein Brooks, you should have left that to Mr. SHIOBARA. Unfortunately we do

not know when you come to the lectern what you are going to talk about.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: We assumed, may it planted your Honor, that the Minister of Industries and Commerce during the year 1937, when these plans were being put into effect, would be able to give this Tribunal some assistance.

Mid SHIOBARA: I think it is asking too much to expect this witness to speak about the five year plan inasmuch as he had no personal connection what-soever with it. With respect to this question, the defense expects to have the witness OKALA, Kikusubaro appear as a witness to testify.

No redirect, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. SHIOBARA: I call the witness OWADA, Teiji.

TEIJI OWADA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHIOBARA:

Q Please give your name, date of birth, place of birth and present address.

A My name is OWADA, Teiji. I was born in OITA Prefecture. My present address is Shibuya Ward, Yoyogi Oyama-che 1071.

Q Will you give us briefly your curriculum data and your official warreer?

Department of the Law College of Kyoto Imperial University. From 1917 until May of - until August of 1918 I was an official in the -- until August of 1940 I was an official in the Ministry of Communications. I was in the Ministry of Communications for twenty-three years all together and during this time I held the office of the chief of the Bureau of Flectricity, director of the Bureau for the Preparation of Electric Power Control, and finally Vice-Minister of Communications which was the last position held.

Q Mr. Witness, were you personally connected

5

1

2

3

7

9

10

12

13

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

as an official of the government with the enforcement of the National Electric Power Control Law?

A On orders from the Minster of Communications
I was directly concerned with the drafting and carrying
it into effect of this law.

Q Did you read, Mr. Witness, the sections relating to electric power in the statement given by Mr. Liebert to this Tribunal?

read in newspapers that Mr. Liebert had given testimony on Parious economic and financial matters concerning Japan and I also noticed that he had given testimony in connection with the matter of electricity with which I was directly connected, concerned, and so I read the accounts of his testimony very briefly.

THE PRESIDENT: Didn't he read the evidence as Mr. Liebert gave it in court? If he didn't, his evidence isn't going to be as valuable as it might be. If he read only a brief account of Mr. Liebert's evidence he certainly isn't qualified to contradict it.

Q I think I showed you the statement given by Mr. Liebert to this Tribunal to you. Have you seen it and read it?

A I read extracts from his testimony which

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dealt with electricity and electric power with which 7 was directly concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, that isn't clear enough. He said he read a brief account of the evidence. Did he read all the evidence that Liebert gave about this particular branch ofindustry?

Now, may I ask you, Mr. Witness, you have read the entire statement of Mr. Liebert in connection with electricity, did you not?

THE INTERPRETER: In so far as it relates to electricity.

A I read all of what I considered to be Mr. Liebert's statements regarding electric power and electricity and also I read extracts from the transcript of the proceedings of this Tribunal which related to that subject.

THE MONITOR: Which related to Mr. Liebert's examination and his statement.

THE PRESIDENT: You should not have led him as to what he read, Mr. SHIOBARA.

(Continued) When I said I read it over briefly I didn't mean to say that I didn't read the whole of it but to say that I didn't take the time to read it with a scrupulous regard to every single detail of that testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: The position isn't a happy one but we will recess now until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200. a recess was taken.)

.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

Kapleau & Eder

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330, the Honorable Henri Fernard, Fember from the Republic of France, now sitting.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. SHIOBARA.

FEIJI OWADA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR, SHIOBARA (Continued):

o What is the date of the enforcement of the state control system of electric power?

THE MONITOR: Of the national electric power control law.

A The main provisions of the national electric power control law were put in force from the 10th of August 1938.

or control -- development or control of electric

power by government and civilian officials concerned

converted any cases where studies and

investigations were conducted concerning utilization

or control -- development or control of electric

power by government and civilian officials concerned

rrior to enforcement of the present law? And if
there were any such cases please state the reasons
and circumstances leading up to the enforcement -leading up to the investigation and studies, briefly.

A I have heard in connection with this question of generating electric power from water -- when this whole question of developing water power was brought up, the question of whether or not it would be better to let the development of water be carried out by non-governmental agencies, was quite a serious one.

The reason is that since water power is a natural resource it should be developed in a way that would be of benefit to the public at large, that it should not be used simply for the purpose of making profit.

For these reasons this question was -became a serious problem -- was considered a serious
problem from the very beginning of setting up our
administrative policy regarding this matter.

In order to generate electricity by water power there is a great need for fixed assets and consequently a large expense is necessary. And therefore in the very beginning it was decided that an appeal would be made to the people's desire for

3 4

6

7 8

9

10

12

14

16

18

17

20 21

19

22

25

24

personal profits, and capital to begin such enterprise would be gathered in that way. Therefore,
whenever the use of water power was permitted it was
always on the understanding that in case of public
necessity such -- the privilege of such utilization
would be returned to the government.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

BRIGADIER CUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, we are reluctant to object, but we submit that this evidence is quite irrelevant to any issue in this case or to the evidence that he has come here to give.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the impression I have formed too, but I suppose we will have to persist, to see if he is going to say something that is relevant and material.

MR. SHIOBARA: This witness is called here to -- not only to refute testimony given by Mr. Liebert concerning state control of electricity, but also to explain the real aspect of state control of electricity that was enforced in Japan at that time.

A Therefore the government, for its part, has for the past several decades always held to -- firmly held to its -- to the principle that should an occasion of public necessity arise the system of

1' 2 3

utilizing water power for profits would be changed to a system of utilizing water power for the public benefits. However, as time went on it was found that the private ownership -- private utilization of water power for profit, had several faults in it, and therefore NODA, Utaro, who was Minister of Communication from 1918 to 1921, concrete steps were taken to investigate the advantages of public control of electric power, and a draft plan was tentatively formulated.

Concerning this problem at the time there is a record of the questions and enswers given in the House of Peers on this problem between Mr.

NAKAJOJI, member of the House of Peers, and Minister NODA.

THE PRESIDENT: This appears to be all very remote from the real question, whether and to what extent, if at all, the development of water power in Japan was directed to war purposes more specifically.

A The reason I have given this answer -- these answers -- is that on reading Mr. Liebert's testimony I received the impression that Mr. Liebert strongly stressed that the sole reason for the state control of electric power was for -- to prepare for war, and I wish to over turn the basis of his testimony

on the -- by revealing the fact that it was not that at all, but that the Communications Ministry had from the very beginning always considered this problem of state control of electricity.

about the circumstances leading up to the enforcement of the electric power state control law, its object and its contents. Will you answer to those points briefly?

state, Mr. President, that before -- the circumstances at the time this law was being considered and leading up to the actual carrying out into effect of this law were circumstances in which Japan found herself -- correction -- which Japan found very -- faced with very serious aspects. May I therefore state -- touch somewhat on these aspects, which I believe to be of some importance?

THE PRESIDENT: They can be important only so far as they bear on the issues, whether all this development of water power in Japan was directed toward war purposes. We don't want a dissertation on the electric situation in Japan.

Brigadier Quilliam.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, may I venture to remind the Tribunal that Mr. Liebert gave evidence that until 1938, when this control law was passed, all the generating companies were private concerns. The issue raised by him

was that from the adoption of that law the industry became totalitarian.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, this witness purposed to give evidence to the effect that for decades, I think is the expression he used, they were tending toward totalitarianism in public interest to avoid the making of large profits by private industry. Perhaps we have heard enough on that sub-issue.

BY MR. SHIOBARA:

Q Well, then, Mr. Witness, you are not required to explain in detail the circumstances leading up to the enforcement of this law, but explain briefly the purpose of this law and the contents of it so that the doubts will be cleared about this question.

MR. SHIOBARA: Mr. President, I wish to get leave of the Court to let this witness use his memo, if he has any with him, if he comes across dates and figures in the course of his testimony, so that he can testify correctly.

THE PRESIDENT: He will always be allowed to refresh his memory in a proper way. Freceed to question him.

THE WITNESS: Then, I shall continue my testimony.

The President has just referred to this

question, to the fact that it seems that Japanese industry was -- that we were trying to swing Japanese industry towards totalitarianism, but as far as electric power industry was concerned we had no such idea. Only as far as electricity generated by water power is concerned, this industry -- we considered that that industry must be given a public nature. Water power is almost the only natural resource of Japan. I understand that even in countries such as America and the U.S.S.R., which have abundant resources of water power, the opinion has been held that the development of this water power should be carried on as a public enterprise.

Now, if I may state the purpose -- now, if I may state for what purpose we intended to develop water power as a public enterprise, I believe that self-sufficiency is the means by which a country can avert war or autocracy; but as everybody knows, Japan is a country which absolutely cannot become a self-sufficient country.

THE PRESIDENT: His function here is to contradict Liebert, if he can, that is, to make statements of fact which are inconsistent with Liebert's evidence. From the evidence given by Liebert and the witness the Court will draw infer-

3)

.

ences of fact and on those facts will come to its conclusion. This witness is endeavoring to argue the case. Let him confine himself to statements of fact.

MR. SHIOBARA: I understand. However, as this witness is one of the leading figures who contributed to the enactment of electric power state control law, I thought it was useful to the Court to listen to the opinion of this witness, which can be treated as a fact.

THE PRESIDENT: No matter who he is, he cannot decide questions which we must decide. In his position he should have valuable knowledge, apart from opinions, which would help us.

O As Mr. President just pointed out, will you try to avoid expressing your opinion and testify on the basis of facts the purpose and the contents of the electric power state control law?

A I understand well the President's advice.

One thing I do wish to say, however, is that Mr. Liebert states at the very beginning of his testimony concerning this matter that the electric power state control law was passed for the sole purpose of preparing for war.

Whalen & Dude

THE PRESIDENT: We said at the time we would disregard that. We are not accepting Mr. Liebert's cpinions.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

I shall answer your question. One purpose of the Electric Power State Control Law was to insure development of Japanese water power over a long period of time. That is to say, if the development of water power were to have been continued in the way it had been at that time, in a piecemeal sort of way, the available water power in Japan would have been exhausted in a very short time. Therefore, if this method were to be changed for one of developing water power on a large scale, unnecessary waste of water power could be avoided and the water power could be utilized in a most economical and useful way.

Next, concerning the situation relative to each generating station, the western part of Japan is very scarce in water power. In contrast, the eastern part of Japan is rich in water power. Were these generating stations in east and west to be joined by power lines, the western section of Japan would be able to economize on the coal which had hitherto been used for generating purposes and do away with the generation of electricity by coal. The economization

of coal was another one of the purposes of this Electric Power State Control Law.

Third, the question of sending power to agricultural districts. In comparison with sending electric power to agricultural districts, from a purely profit-making point of view, it was much cheaper to send power to large cities; and thus the electric power industry had a tendency to concentrate around large cities.

Thus, when we compare the consumption of electric power in Japan with that of other countries, we find that the average consumption of electric power consumption per person is 400 kilowatt hours. In America, this average is 888 kilowatt hours. In Norway, one person is using — the average for one person works out to as much as 3800 kilowatt hours.

Q You may look at your memc.

A Thank you. These figures mean that the average household in Japan does not utilize electric power as much as it should. And when we were considering this question of electric power control, we took Switzerland as a model. That is to say, Switzerland, like Japan, is a country which lacks natural resources. But because the use of electric power was widely taken advantage of in homes, small-scale factories with the home as a unit grew up in Switzerland and thus aided in

maintaining Switzerland's economy.

Therefore, we considered that Japan also must develop household industries in order to maintain her economy in the future. But we considered that if the development of electric power were to be continued on a profit-making basis, the bringing of electric power to the household was impossible. Furthermore, as I stated before, electricity can be supplied to large-scale industries at a far lower cost than to ordinary homes and smaller establishments. So that in connection with this, the problem of antagonism between large cities and rural areas also arose. It is for these reasons that we drafted plans for large-scale development and maintenance of electric power.

The next question naturally follows: Why did these plans come to completion around the year 1938 -- why were these plans adopted around the year 1938?

I touched on this subject very briefly before. But from around the year 1934 -- beginning from around the year 1929, international bloc economies began to be set up so that Japan was faced with the necessity for setting up a minimum economy of self-sufficiency.

I wish to say at that time that we hoped that by effectuating state control of electric power, electric power would be made plentiful and also

available to the public-at-large at low cost, which would enable us to make use of other resources and to maintain a minimum standard of living.

To sum up, the motives for the purpose of effectuating state control of electric power by means of water power was, first, to utilize available water power in the most rational and effective manner, and to utilize it so that it could be utilized one hundred per cent.

Next, to economize oil and coal which are very scarce natural resources in Japan by the wider use of electric power for heating purposes.

Third, to make plentiful the generation of electric power, and thus to make it available at low cost, and, as far as cost was concerned, to make it available at a special low cost to whatever was of a public nature, to make it the motive power for -- correction, by sending electric power to homes and to agrarian areas, to encourage the development of small-scale industries, and by synthesizing these small-scale industries try to maintain Japan's economy.

Next, concerning the production of fertilizers,
Japan had been importing fertilizers such as nitrates
and sulphuric ammonia from abroad, but if electric
power were to be made more plentiful it would be
possible to manufacture these fertilizers to a certain
extent in Japan. And by these means we hoped to
increase the production of food to a certain extent
also.

In this way we hoped at least to establish even some semblance of a self-sufficient economy, and we considered that this was a symbol of a movement for peace.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have told us what

your hopes were. What were your achievements?

Liebert, as you know, gave evidence to the effect that a very large proportion of electric power was consumed in war industries, in those more directly connected with the production of munitions of war and implements of war.

MR. SHIOBARA: Just as you say, Mr. President. However, in my last question I asked the witness to testify about the contents of the Electric Power State Control Law -- also to which the witness has not replied yet.

THE WITNESS: Then, may I reply first of all to the question from the defense counsel?

THE PRESIDENT: There is a limit to the extent to which he can deal even with relevant and material matters.

THE WITNESS: As for the question of what the achievements of the execution of the Electric Power Control Law were, we started from the premise that in order to achieve what we hoped to achieve, first of all, the large scale development of electric power as well as the transmission of electric power was necessary. Therefore, the basic policies on the development of water power and the supply of electric power were to be decided by the government. Therefore,

10

11

12

13

the government made the decisions as to the basic policies. But in making these decisions they were not drawn up merely by government officials, but on the basis of questions submitted to the Electric Power Investigation Committee and the replies which that committee made. As for the composition of this committee, the greater part of the members were representatives of consumers and they consisted of members of the House of Peers, members of the House of Representatives and other people who had a high level of intelligence and experience.

Now, in executing these policies drawn up by the government on the basis of such questions and answers, the government did not carry it out itself. It set up a special company known as the Japan Electric Power Distribution, Generation and Transmission Company, and made this company carry it out. This company is a company set up as other companies. The stockholders of this company are entirely private individuals such as those of other companies.

Q When the Japan Electric Generation and Transmission Company was established was there any such law which was called "law for the development -- increase of production of electric power?" If there was any such law, would you please explain what it

is, briefly.

A Of course, there was a plan for the increase of power production. However, as for the figures, I do not have the details -- I do not have them down to the very small numbers, so I should like to be permitted to give them in round numbers. I do not have the exact notes on the figures here.

Before that, I should like to state that before the Electric Power Control Law there was an Electric Power Business Law -- Enterprise Law. By this law an electric commission was set up.

THE PRESIDENT: If this witness persists in going in this roundabout way we may take control.

We may require him to answer our questions.

THE WITNESS: I shall soon reach my conclusion.

By means of this electric commission the plans for the increase of electric power were set up year by year even before the promulgation of the Electric Power Control Law. By the promulgation of the Electric Power Control Law the only change made was that these yearly plans were not drawn up by individual, small-scale profit-making companies, but were drawn up by this one Japan Electric Generation and Transmission Company on a large scale.

The dovelopment plans of the Japan Electric Generation and Transmission Company were put into effect in 1939 when a four-year plan was drawn up, and this plan called for the development of 350,000 kilowatts per year. Besides this there were smallscale generating stations operated by individual factories and others, so that the total plans for the production of electric power came to about 500,000 kilowatts per year.

S 1 p 2 a t 3 t 4 & 5 Y c 6 d #

Q In this connection, Mr. Liebert said, as the Tribunal also pointed out, that the electric power works generated was almost all switched to war industry. Now, Mr. Witness, will you explain the plans for distribution of electricity which were in force at the time you were connected with that enterprise?

A I have no exact recollection of how it was planned to distribute electric power at the present moment.

Q Is that all you have to say?

A We understand that at the same time of the enforcement of the Electric Power State Control Law a system or rather a commission by the name of Extraordinary Electric Power Research Commission was appointed.

Q Now, of what kind of people did this commission consist?

A This commission was set up by the representatives on this commission from the Communications Ministry, which was the parent ministry, who were merely the Parliamentary Vice-Minister and the regular Vice-Minister. Also, the regular Railway Vice-Minister was also on this commission; but aside from these three officials, of the thirty-five members of this commission thirty-two were private individuals and were:

10

8

11

12

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

..

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

representatives of the comsumers of the electrical enterprises or were men -- were intellectuals and men 2 of experience and were either members of the House of 3 Peers or of the House of Representatives. What was the purpose of the control imposed on the distribution of power? The question was not quite clear.

I said control on the distribution of power.

Since this control of the distribution of electric power was effected after my resignation from the ministry my answer may not be very satisfactory. I believe, however, from what I know, that the purpose of this was that even if the Japan Electric Generation and Transmission Company were set up, unless distribution agencies which directly distributed this electric power to the consumers came under some kind of control, there would be not much sense in having set up this company. And I also believe that the research which was conducted in the Communications Ministry on the British bridge system also had some effect in determining this policy.

THE PRESIDENT: This man was called to contradict Liebert. So far he has not devoted much time to doing it.

I shall now ask you a simple question.

the outset of Mr. Liebert's testimony the following is written. In the statement of Mr. Liebert it is written:

4

"The electric power industry was one of the first Japanese industries to be nationalized, and as such one of the original pillars in the new structure in support of total war."

6

8

9

As one of those who actually practically dealt with the problem, would you answer to the following two points?

10

11

12

HE PRESIDENT: I told you we disregarded Liebert's opinion. Let him deal, if he can, with the figures Liebert gave; otherwise his mission here fails.

13

14

THE WITNESS: In view of the President's

15 16

previous ruling, that the opinions of Mr. Liebert

17

are to be disregarded, I do not think it is necessary

18 19 for me to answer this question. There is one thing

20

I would like to say as witness. The President has stated that I was called here to refute Mr. Liebert's

21 22

testimony; but when I came here I had no idea that

I was being called for that purpose.

23

BRIGADIFR QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, as I understood the witness, he announced that he was about to make another speech not in answer

25

to any question put by counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: He came here, he said, after reading Liebert's evidence to reply to it, apparently. That is the only conclusion I could draw. Why did he read Liebert's evidence unless he was going to meet it? He was not called here to confirm it, was he?

MR. SHIOBARA: As you say, we have shown him Mr. Liebert's statement, and he also may have testified, expressed his opinions. However, our purpose of calling him here wasn't merely to refute testimony made by Mr. Liebert, but it was also our purpose to let him testify about the motives and purpose for which the Electric Power Control Law was enforced in those days, as the witness is one of those who was responsible for the enforcement of that law -- for the enactment of that law.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, subject to what my colleagues think, I think we have heard enough on those points. Can he deal with the figures that Liebert gives?

MR. SHIOBARA: Mr. Liebert's testimony was based mostly on the materials which he had obtained from the Japanese Government, and as far as the figures are concerned they are mostly correct. However, as to the conclusion drawn from those figures

and object of those plans as interpreted by Mr.
Liebert, I should like to point out that there are
some facts, some conclusions and interpolations
which lead to misunderstanding. Therefore, I
called this witness here to let him testify about
the motives and purposes for which this man as one
of the leading figures in the enactment of the law
at that time held.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-ings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, we do not propose to cross-examine the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is excused on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
MR. SHIOBARA: No redirect examination.
THE PRESIDENT: There can't be.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I am counsel OKAMOTO, Shoichi.
I should like to call on OKADA, Kikusaburo as the next
witness.

This examination will be based on documents 841 and 842. I should like to know if the Bench has those documents.

THE INTERPRETER: "Documents" should read "exhibits."

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

Bureau the war ended.

KIKUSABURO OKADA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. S. OKAMOTO: What is your name? OKADA, Kikusaburo. Will you sum up your personal history? In 1918 I was commissioned Second Lieutenant and since then have served in the army. In 1943 I was appointed Major General. THE PRESIDENT: What is your present address? 14 We must have that for identification purposes. THE WITNESS: My present address is Tokyo City. 16 (Continuing) In 1945 I was appointed a member of the Military Affairs Bureau and was in that post when the war ended. While I was in the Military Affairs

From 1935, except for a very short period, I was in the War Preparations Section of the Mobilization Bureau of the War Ministry and have been connected for all that time with national mobilization and military mobilization. Correction: I have been connected with the formulation of plans for national mobilization

and military mobilization.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: May the witness be shown exhibits No. 841 and 842.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were handed to the witness.)

Were you connected in any way with -- correction 7 please -- With reference to document No. 841, I should 8 like to ask you, Mr. Witness, if you were connected in lany way with the outline -- with the drawing up of the 10 outline of the Five-Year Plan for production of war 11 materials. War Office, June 23, 1937; and now turning to the exhibit No. 842, Essentials of the Five-Year 13 Program of important industries, War Ministry, 29 May 1937? Then the second part of the same document, Resume of Policy Relating to Execution of Summary of Five-Year Program of important industries, dated 10 June 1937, and, finally, the part three of the same document entitled Outline of the Plan for the Expansion of Productive Power by Planning Board.

THE MONITOR: Slight correction on the first The date should read June 23, 1941. That is the date. first date mentioned by the interpreter.

Expecially concerning exhibit 841, this was drawn up by myself.

What was the original purpose for formulating Q

24

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

those plans?

A Each plan had a definite purpose, but, if I should state that purpose in a word, it means the increase of our national power.

Exhibit 841 is entirely concerned with military plans. Exhibit 842 has a good deal of military aspects in it, but it is a plan for the establishment of a peace-time economy. At the time, our country was in a position — in such a position that it had to beware of and to take measures to cope with the phenomenal expansion in military power of the Russian — of Soviet Russia — of the national power and military power.

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In those days what information did the army receive concerning the development of industrial plans in Russia and what estimates were made by the army in those days?

The U.S.S.R's development of its industries could only be called startling after passing through the first and second five year plans. If we take the example of steel production, in 1929 it had attained a pre-war level but after the completion of the first and second five year plans it attained a level three and a half times in excess of pre-war days. In 1933 the production of steel in -- correction: in 1933 the U.S.S.R. ranked third in the production of steel among the countries of the world and second among the countries of Europe. The following year it had advanced to second in the world and first among European countries. A final report of the -- it was finally disclosed that in 1937 the production of steel in the U.S.S.R. had reached 17,700,000 tons. Furthermore, we were in a position to believe that with the completion of the second five year plan the Soviet Union was about to begin a third five year plan energetically. In these circumstances we were forced to come to the conclusion that Japan also should at least endeavor to reach half of the Soviet Union's

24

13

15

16

17

18

20

23

plenned production at the time of completion of the third five year plan.

Q How did the plans on the part of Japan advance?

A The first demands the army made on the government were that by the year 1941, thich was the year scheduled for the completion of the plan, the production of steel in Japan and Manchuria would total ten million tons. However, the enforcement of the plan was delayed because of retarded decision of the government and the first -- at the end of the first goal the amount produced was a little lower than the expected amount of production including 995 million tons in Japan and 62 million tons in Manchuria, making a total of 157 million tons.

THE INTERPRETER: 10,570,000 tons.

Q . May we understand then that this plan was based primarily on military needs?

A This plan was a plan for the establishment of a peace time economy in which, however, a good deal of the military element was included.

Q Those military requirements to which you referred, do they mean that they were military requirements necessary to wage a war?

A . No, we had no such idea of waging a war from

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

our side.

What was the primary object of the establish-Q ment of peace industry?

Because many of Japan's important industries depended for their raw materials heavily on imports from abroad, the economic basis of our country was very shaky and economic independence was not a reality. Therefore, our country was at a great disadvantage in international trade. This fact, as the world began to divide up into blocs, became more and more severe. Hitherto our country had been able to maintain a precerious trade belance by developing the textile industry -- primative industries as well as a few light industries. We believed that it was necessary at that time that Japan should develop her heavy industries so that she would be fully qualified as a modern state and also for the future welfare of her people.

By what elements or factors were the periods of those plans decided?

At the time we believed that the Soviet Union would embark upon a third five year plan and we regulated our plan so that it would come to an end around the time when we believed the -- in conjunction with the third five year plan, but in reality there is no special deep meaning behind the year on which

24

our five year plan was scheduled to end.

THE INTERPRETER: The previous statement the witness made should be corrected to: In drawing up our plans for this five year plan we kept in mind the Soviet's third five year plan -- the termination period of the third five year plan.

any plan for industrial development must naturally cover a certain cycle of years and as it will be clear if one glances at the documents of the War Ministry we intended that when the first five year plan was finished we would embark upon a second five year plan and go along in those cycles of five years, so no importance was placed on the end of 1941 when the first five year plan was scheduled to end.

Q You have now referred to part one of War Ministry Plans. Now by that did you mean Exhibit No. 842?

THE INTERPRETER: The first part of exhibit 842. Is this the document you were referring to?

A Yes.

Greenberg & Barton

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Was the possible outbreak of the China Incident -- was taken into consideration when those plans were made?

A It was not in our minds at all.

Q Now, Mr. Witness, can you make it clear by quoting passages from this document -- from these documents that the plans as announced in documents -- exhibits number 641 and in parts 1 and 2 of exhibit 842 were not formulated in anticipation of the China Incident?

(Whereupon, papers were handed to the witness.)

Would the Marshal of the Court please leave the document -- those documents in the hands of the witness because he will require them often.

(Continuing) Will you examine those documents before giving your answer?

A I can prove that by many points. First, concerning exhibit 841, Outline of the Five Year Plan for Production of War Materials, this plan, because of the sudden outbreak of the China Incident, was not even used. It died a natural death.

Next, as to exhibit 842, this plan also -- because of the outbreak of the China Incident, the plans of the various ministries which were in charge

23

of the mobilization of goods were set completely awry so that this plan — the carrying out of this plan during the year 1937 was not possible, and the actual execution of this plan was only begun in 1938. Therefore, this which was supposed to be a five year plan became a four year plan. This can be ascertained if we look at the heading of part 3 of exhibit 842 in which the date on which this plan was decided by the cabinet conference is given as well as on page 2 of the same part where the yearly estimates for the production of each kind of material are given.

Next, as for exhibit 841, as I stated, this was not actually used because of the outbreak of the China Incident which necessitated a much bigger -- much plans for the increase of production on a far wider scale, especially for the mobilization of munitions. And, in order to carry this out, and in order to use as much as possible for military -- for direct military consumption, the plans given in exhibit 842 had necessarily to be curtailed and changed in great measure so that the actual carrying out of this plan is quite different from the plan itself.

Fourth, both exhibits 841 and 842 planned only a very limited economic control. But, because of the unforeseen outbreak of the China Incident,

first of all, the mobilization of industry was made necessary and, second, a large scale economic mobilization was made necessary. And finally, a total mobilization of the national strength had to be carried out.

Lastly -- correction: These facts are proof that, in drawing up these plans, we did not take all possibilities into consideration and that, because of the outbreak of the China Incident, these plans, in their fundamental ideas, were set completely awry, and we had to draw up new ones. In short, these plans were only possible of execution and of being carried out upon the assumption that a great incident or a great war would not occur during the period of the carrying out of that plan.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, you are giving your evidence in a way that we can hear, but there is no need to speak so loudly. You have a microphone in front of you. It is rather distressing to have to listen to a loud voice in these circumstances.

Q Besides those plans, were there any plans in Japan ready for waging of war against China?

A No.

Q Mr. Witness, you testified that the outline of the Five Year Plan for Production of War Materials, as set out in the exhibit No. 841, was abandoned be-

•

1 2 3

5

7 8

9

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

21

23

25

first of all, the mobilization of industry was made necessary and, second, a large scale economic mobilization was made necessary. And finally, a total mobilization of the national strength had to be carried out.

Lastly -- correction: These facts are proof that, in drawing up these plans, we did not take all possibilities into consideration and that, because of the outbreak of the China Incident, these plans, in their fundamental ideas, were set completely awry, and we had to draw up new ones. In short, these plans were only possible of execution and of being carried out upon the assumption that a great incident or a great war would not occur during the period of the carrying out of that plan.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, you are giving your evidence in a way that we can hear, but there is no need to speak so loudly. You have a microphone in front of you. It is rather distressing to have to listen to a loud voice in these circumstances.

Q Besides those plans, were there any plans in Japan ready for waging of war against China?

A No.

Q Mr. Witness, you testified that the outline of the Five Year Plan for Production of War Materials, as set out in the exhibit No. 841, was abandoned be-

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

fore its realization. Now, Mr. Witness, it was a very important statement that you made there. Are you sure that it was true?

A I am sure. There is no mistake.

Were any orders given -- were no orders given concerning the execution of plans as embedded in the exhibit No. 841?

A No, there were no such orders.

Does that mean, then, that those plans were not official plans?

A They are official plans. These plans received the approval of War Minister BUGIYAMA on June 23, 1937. But, in connection with this approval, approval was not given which would actually carry this plan into effect; that is, of conveying this plan to the various departments of the army.

Q Why was not the approval obtained concerning the carrying out of those plans?

A Before this plan could be carried out there were many, many problems which had to be materialized -- which had to be taken care of. If this plan were to be conveyed to the various departments of the army without first taking care of these various problems, it would be quite meaningless.

Were there any parts which concerned other

17

18

19

21

22

23

ministries other than the War Ministry?

- A Yes, there were.
- Q How were they dealt with?

A Concerning plans which had to do with the other ministries, those parts which could be embodied in exhibit 842 were thus -- so embodied, and the remaining portions we planned to carry out after discussions with the various ministries concerned on each occasion.

Q Were not the plans in exhibit 841 approved by the War Minister after having gone through due consultations with other ministries conserned?

A This plan was set up without any previous consultation with other ministries. This plan was merely an indication of the direction in which we planned to go; and, in order to carry this plan out, we intended to take up the various details of this plan in consultation with other ministries one by one.

Q Well, then, those plans -- correction, please: Well, then, the Finance Minister was not concerned with those plans -- as far as those plans go, the Finance Minister had no connection whatsoever with them.

A That is so; he had no connection with these

plans -- this plan.

Q Does the document itself show that it -- or, rather, those plans obtained the approval only of the War Minister?

A If you look at the top of this document,
you will see the words "military secret" -- look at
the cover. If this document was a document to be
circulated among the various departments in the army,
in accordance with the regulations concerning secret
documents within the War Ministry, this document should
have been given -- specified as "Military Secret," and
then a number should have been given - a classification number should have been given.

Q However, is it not true that preparations for the execution of those plans could be made later, subsequent to the approval given by the War Minister?

A If the matter had been carried out according to plan, probably it would have gone on in the direction which you just mentioned. But, two weeks after June 23, when the War Minister's approval was given, the Lukouchiao Incident suddenly broke out on July 7 -- correction: War Minister SUGIYAMA -- it was impossible to carry out in detail and to try to put into effect the various matters which pertained in this plan within those short two weeks. But, upon the sudden

plan.

outbreak of the China Incident, the army was faced with the necessity of giving a much more detailed and much more specific order which would adequately cover the needs of the situation to the various departments concerned instead of this very rough and small-scale

Q That is a very important point. Will you enlarge on it?

A In order to meet the requirements of the China Incident, it was necessary to have quite a large supply of goods in order to fill up the attrition which would be caused by war. However, exhibit 841, the plan given in exhibit 841 is a peace-time plan and was concerned with how to guide the development of munitions industries with the small peacetime budget of the army -- in the framework of the small peace-time budget of the army.

with such a plan it was impossible to keep up with the heavy losses which a war -- which the incident would entail. In the first place, the plan given in exhibit 841 is a plan based on -- which based on the amount of the budget which the army expected to be able to secure during the years 1937 to 1943. The total amount of the budget which the army hoped to secure in those seven years was three billion.

i

7 8

But, after the outbreak of the China Incident, first an expenditure of three billion ven was authorized, and then, in the extraordinary session of the Diet which met in September of 1937, a special budget of fourteen billion yen was authorized for the army. That is to say, within only half a year -- within barely half a year the army used approximately twenty billion yen; and from 1938 and succeeding years, the army's budget increased by several tens of billions. I believe that this alone would suffice to clarify the fact that this plan given in exhibit 841 war quite insufficient to meet the requirements of the China Incident.

Q Can you prove by quoting a passage or passages from the document 841 that those plans were based upon peacetime -- small peacetime budgets?

A Yes, I can. To begin with, under No. 4 of the preface, these words are given: "From the standpoint of controlling the pace of its execution, this outline shall depend firstly on the basis of the sixth war budget."

Next, on page 3, in the paragraph "1, Policy," these words are given: "In order to cope with the present situation and to establish the foundation of our national defense powers accompanying the

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

perfection of armaments" --

I should like to explain this in detail. In 1936 the army believed that, in order to cope with Soviet expansion, it was necessary to complete -- to replenish military preparations in the six years between 1937 and 1942. Within the army this was called "The Six Year Plan for Military Replenishment." After negotiations with the Finance Ministry, the amount of the budget which the War Ministry had originally planned was cut, and the length of the years was lengthened by one year so that it became a seven year plan, and the total budget, thirty-three billion yen, which the Finance Ministry at the time gave infermal consent -- to which. But this informal approval was given on the understanding that -- for the actual spending of this money, discussions will be conducted on the basis of the actual situation year by year and after the whole thing had been presented to the Diet for approval.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine tomorrow morning.

> (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 13 March 1947, at 0930.)

24

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

perfection of armaments" --

I should like to explain this in detail. In 1936 the army believed that, in order to cope with Soviet expansion, it was necessary to complete -- to replenish military preparations in the six years between 1937 and 1942. Within the army this was called "The Six Year Plan for Military Replenishment." After negotiations with the Finance Ministry, the amount of the budget which the War Ministry had originally planned was cut, and the length of the years was lengthened by one year so that it became a seven year plan, and the total budget, thirty-three billion yen, which the Finance Ministry at the time gave infermal consent -- to which. But this informal approval was given on the understanding that -- for the actual spending of this money, discussions will be conducted on the basis of the actual situation year by year and after the whole thing had been presented to the Diet for approval.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine tomorrow morning.

> (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 13 March ' 1947, at 0930.)